



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Cen

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,108	09/30/2003	Soumyadeb Ghosh	126344-1	4989
23413	7590	12/14/2007		
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002			EXAMINER SANDERS, KRIELLION ANTIONETTE	
			ART UNIT 1796	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/14/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/675,108

Applicant(s)

GHOSH ET AL.

Examiner

Kriellion A. Sanders

Art Unit

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 9-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-23 and 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9-16, 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims 17-23 and 25 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse. Claims 17-23 and 25 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made with traverse in the reply filed on 9/30/05.

A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter

disclosed but not claimed in the reference, *prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131*; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

1. Claims 1-6, 9-16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as being unpatentable over Ameraseka et al, US 2002/0183438 taken with Elkovitch et al US 2005/0070657 and Nahass et al, US Patent No. 5,591,382.

1. The art is relied upon for reasons of record. Ameraseka et al, US 2002/0183438 discloses conductive polymeric composition comprising

Either of a Thermoplastic and/or thermoset resin and

An electrically conductive filler system further comprising:

Small carbon fibers and

Carbon powder and/or non-conductive filler

The small carbon fibers may be carbon nanotubes having a diameter of 2000 nanometers or may be graphitized carbon fibers. The carbon nanotubes would correspond to the nanosized conductive filler of applicant's claims. The carbon fibers have aspect ratios greater than or equal to 5. The small carbon fibers may be used with conductive carbon black powder. The carbon black is used in an amount that is greater than 0.25% of the total composition. See paragraphs

0015 and 0019. Since the small carbon fibers of Ameraseka et al may be graphitized or may be carbon nanotubes, the reference does not really distinguish between the two components.

Therefore applicant's use of both nanosized conductive fillers and graphite would expectedly yield an additive effect since a nanosized conductive filler may actually be graphite.

This is further documented by Elkovitch et al, US 2005/0070657, which teaches that nanosized conductive fillers may be carbon fibers, carbon black and graphite. See paragraph 0098. Elkovitch teaches compositions of thermoplastic and/or thermoset polymers, a single wall nanotube composition and a nanosized conductive filler, such as graphite. Applicant's nanosized conductive fillers may be single wall carbon nanotubes as set forth in present claim 11.

Elkovitch et al therefore teaches these components of applicant's claims. Patentee further discloses a poly(arylene ether) composition having an intrinsic viscosity of about 0.10 to about 0.60 deciliters per gram (dl/g), as measured in chloroform at 25.degree. C. This may or may not overlap with the viscosity requirements of applicant's claim 16, since conversion formats are not readily available. However, it does relate a need to synthesize the compositions within certain parameters. Such parameters are considered to be obvious to the ordinary practitioner. Also see paragraphs 0010, 0013, 0087 and claim 1.

It is common to form carbon fibers from polyacrylonitrile or pitch. Nothing unobvious is seen in using fibers derived from these components. See Nahass et al at col. 1, lines 28-35.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 9/28/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

At page 8 of the remarks filed by applicant on 9/28/07, applicant states that each one of the present application, and patents to Amarasekera and Elkovitch are under obligation of assignment to the same assignee, Sabic Innovative Plastics. In order to overcome the rejection, it is necessary that ***applicant show that the current application and prior art references were under obligation of assignment to the same assignee at the time the current invention was made. It is not sufficient that applicant indicate the present application and prior art references are currently commonly assigned.***

Applicant's argument that Elkovitch was filed only one day prior to the present According to Patent Office records, an assignment record for S.N. 10/675,108 was recorded on 9/360/2003 and indicates General Electric Company as the assignee invention is not convincing. The filing date is prior to the filing date of the present invention.

Applicant has submitted an affidavit under Rule 131 to antedate the Amerasekera reference. The affidavit has not been found to be persuasive because it does not antedate the effective date of the reference, which is the filing date. Applicant's declaration filed under Rule 131 has not been found to be persuasive because although it does attempt to antedate the publication date of the Ameresakera patent, the declaration does not antedate the filing date.

Applicant argues that the rejection is improper because the graphite in the presently claimed invention is different from the graphitized or partially graphitized vapor grown carbon fibers described in Amerasekera et al. because the graphite of the present invention may be synthetically or naturally produced but has a flake morphology. In response to

applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the flake morphology of the graphite component in the present invention) is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Double Patenting

Response to Arguments and Amendments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 5/17/07 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefor the double patenting rejection was previously withdrawn.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Application/Control Number:
10/675,108
Art Unit: 1796

Page 7

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kriellion A. Sanders whose telephone number is 571-272-1122. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:30am-7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Kriellion A. Sanders
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1796

ks